

APPENDIX J

NCAA ATHLETE REVENUE SHARING, SCHOLARSHIPS & NIL COLLECTIVES BY SCHOOL



Estimated NCAA Athlete Revenue Sharing 2025-26:

As part of the *House v. NCAA* proposed settlement, schools will be allowed to share athletic department revenues with their varsity athletes beginning in the 2025-26 academic year. While not finalized, under the proposed revenue sharing model, schools will be allowed to distribute up to 22% of annual athletic revenues to their athletes not to exceed an annual compensation cap estimated to be \$ 21 million per school (scheduled to increase to \$ 33 million per school over the next ten years). We compiled data from the most recently available NCAA membership reporting of 20 Power Conference schools, and arrived at the following estimated revenue sharing allocations per team:

Estimated Revenue Sharing Power School Averages	Team	Average Per Team	Average Roster *	Average Per Athlete
Football < https://nil-ncaa.com/football/>		M	15,029,708	105
Basketball < https://nil-ncaa.com/basketball/>		M	3,209,097	15
Hockey < https://nil-ncaa.com/hockey/>		M	545,334	26
Baseball < https://nil-ncaa.com/baseball/>		M	358,510	34
Basketball < https://nil-ncaa.com/basketball/>		W	229,259	14
Wrestling < https://nil-ncaa.com/wrestling/>		M	123,695	30
Volleyball < https://nil-ncaa.com/volleyball/>		W	101,916	17
Gymnastics < https://nil-ncaa.com/gymnastics/>		W	89,335	19
Softball < https://nil-ncaa.com/softball/>		W	81,799	23
Hockey < https://nil-ncaa.com/hockey/>		W	64,353	25
Soccer < https://nil-ncaa.com/soccer/>		M/W	57,790	28
Track & Field / X-C < https://nil-ncaa.com/ncaa-revenue-sharing-track-field-cross-country/>		M/W	41,761	49
Lacrosse < https://nil-ncaa.com/lacrosse/>		M/W	39,562	41
Swimming < https://nil-ncaa.com/swimming/>		M/W	30,802	30
Rowing < https://nil-ncaa.com/rowing/>		W	19,771	64
Field Hockey < https://nil-ncaa.com/field-hockey/>		W	19,039	25
Tennis < https://nil-ncaa.com/tennis/>		M/W	16,529	9
Golf < https://nil-ncaa.com/golf/>		M/W	12,124	9
Beach Volleyball < https://nil-ncaa.com/beach-vb/>		W	8,372	17
Totals per School		19,432,197		

Football and Men's basketball account for close to 95% of team specific revenues at most Power Conference schools, and athletes on these two teams will be the major beneficiaries under the proposed NCAA revenue sharing model. While football receives the most revenue sharing per team, Men's basketball ends up with a significantly higher average per player due to much smaller roster sizes (15 versus 105).

These are estimates of the *maximum* amount of revenue sharing each school could distribute to its athletes for the 2025-26 fiscal year. Since participation in revenue sharing is optional, a school can elect *not* to share revenue with its athletes or opt to distribute amounts less than the proposed 22% limit. However, doing so would likely put that school at a significant competitive disadvantage in athletic recruiting.

The NCAA model is titled *Revenue Sharing* so the initial cut at an allocation per team will begin with this computation. While close to 95% of all team specific revenue is attributed to football and men's basketball at most P5 schools, other factors will likely affect the ultimate allocation including Title IX considerations.

These are *averages* per athlete. In actuality, a few players per team will get substantially higher than the average, while many will get much less. Let's take football as an example: the average Power conference school will likely allocate around \$ 15 million in annual revenue sharing to football, which based on a NCAA roster limit of 105 results in an *average* of around \$ 143,000 per player. However, a coach may make a commitment of say 10% or \$ 1.5 million per year to land a 5-star quarterback recruit. Then maybe \$ 700,000 per year for some running backs and receivers, plus say \$ 2 million annually for a starting offensive line to block for the running backs and protect that pricey 5-star quarterback recruit. It can quickly add up, and for players who see little if any playing time, their revenue share will also likely be little or none.

* Rosters sizes subject to NCAA proposed limits beginning in 2025-26

Estimated Revenue Sharing by Conference:

By our calculations, NCAA I schools could be shelling out over \$ 1.6 billion annually in revenue sharing beginning next year. Based on NCAA reporting data compiled by *USA Today*, we arrived at the following estimates of 2025-26 revenue sharing by conference and member schools:

Average Annual Athletic Revenues per School *	# of Schools	Revenue per School	22% of Revenue	
SEC < https://nil-ncaa.com/sec/>	16 < https://nil-ncaa.com/sec/>	122,170,753	26,877,566	2
Big Ten < https://nil-ncaa.com/big10/>	18 < https://nil-ncaa.com/big10/>	116,190,176	25,561,839	2
ACC < https://nil-ncaa.com/acc/>	18 < https://nil-ncaa.com/acc/>	85,546,578	18,820,247	1
Big 12 < https://nil-ncaa.com/big12/>	16 < https://nil-ncaa.com/big12/>	66,210,685	14,566,351	1
Pac-12 < https://nil-ncaa.com/pac12/>	2 < https://nil-ncaa.com/pac12/>	60,974,391	13,414,366	1
Sub-total - P5 Schools *	70	\$ 100,420,042	\$ 22,092,409	\$ 18,755,486
Mountain West < https://nil-ncaa.com/mw/>	11 < https://nil-ncaa.com/mw/>	19,862,094	4,369,661	
American Athletic < https://nil-ncaa.com/aac/>	13 < https://nil-ncaa.com/aac/>	13,597,219	2,991,388	
Sun Belt < https://nil-ncaa.com/sb/>	14 < https://nil-ncaa.com/sb/>	9,187,681	2,021,290	
Mid-American < https://nil-ncaa.com/mac/>	12 < https://nil-ncaa.com/mac/>	8,651,993	1,903,438	
Conference USA < https://nil-ncaa.com/cusa/>	10 < https://nil-ncaa.com/cusa/>	7,466,103	1,642,543	
Sub-total - G5 Schools	60	\$ 11,493,375	\$ 2,528,543	\$ 1,875,486
All other NCAA I Schools < https://nil-ncaa.com/d1other/>	232 < https://nil-ncaa.com/d1other/>	\$ 3,881,357	\$ 853,899	\$ 653,899
Totals - All NCAA I Schools	362			

Computed Athletic Department revenue includes event tickets and admission fees, game guarantees, TV, media, licensing, advertising, sponsorships and royalty rights, bowl game, NCAA and conference distributions and all related revenues. Revenue does *not* include direct or indirect school support, student fees or unrecompensed (i.e. charitable) contributions to the athletic department from alumni and boosters.

Based on these estimates, the average Power 5 conference school (\$ 18,755,486) will be able to compensate its athletes over **seven times** what the average Group of 5 school (\$ 2,528,543) and over **twenty times** what all other NCAA I schools (\$ 853,899) will be able to share. Since inception of the NCAA in 1906, all Division I member schools have recruited athletes subject to the same financial parameters: all schools were subject to identical scholarship limits per sport, and no member school could compensate athletes directly. The revenue sharing model scheduled to begin in 2025 will uproot this this long existing level playing field, and drastically alter the competitive balance between NCAA I schools.

* We are confident in these estimates: our computed average annual revenue per P5 conference school came to \$ 100,420,042 – spot on with the \$ 100 million average P5 estimate reportedly used to formulate the parameters of the proposed NCAA revenue sharing model. Note: Revenue sharing is *in addition* to any NIL compensation and athletic scholarships received by athletes.

Note: A separate antitrust case (*Fontenot v. NCAA*) contests the proposed settlement reached in *House v NCAA* as being insufficient. Among the complaints is that the proposed 22% revenue sharing allocation is too low, and by inference that revenue sharing by NCAA member schools should be mandatory, not optional.

Estimated Athlete Revenue Sharing by NCAA I School 2025-26:

The following is an estimate of the maximum amount each public NCAA I school would be allowed to distribute to its athletes under the proposed NCAA revenue sharing agreement. The 22% limit on revenue sharing is also subject to an annual cap estimated to be about \$ 21 million per school for the 2025-26 fiscal year:

Show 15 entries

Search:

Maximum Revenue Sharing Estimates 2025-26	Group	Conf		Annual Revenue	22% of Revenue	2025-26
Ohio State	P5	Big Ten	187,930,323	41,344,671	21,000,000	11%
Michigan	P5	Big Ten	166,204,848	36,565,067	21,000,000	13%
Texas	P5	SEC	161,316,575	35,489,647	21,000,000	13%
Alabama	P5	SEC	143,674,059	31,608,293	21,000,000	15%
Nebraska	P5	Big Ten	142,131,011	31,268,822	21,000,000	15%
Penn State	P5	Big Ten	141,979,389	31,235,466	21,000,000	15%
Texas A&M	P5	SEC	138,935,509	30,565,812	21,000,000	15%
Oklahoma	P5	SEC	134,140,083	29,510,818	21,000,000	16%
Wisconsin	P5	Big Ten	132,091,734	29,060,181	21,000,000	16%
Kentucky	P5	SEC	131,139,792	28,850,754	21,000,000	16%
Arkansas	P5	SEC	128,309,736	28,228,142	21,000,000	16%
Georgia	P5	SEC	125,201,819	27,544,400	21,000,000	17%
Florida	P5	SEC	123,787,622	27,233,277	21,000,000	17%
LSU	P5	SEC	123,379,555	27,143,502	21,000,000	17%

Showing 1 to 15 of 232 entries
◀ Previous **Next** ▶

The above data includes public NCAA Division I colleges only, comprehensive private school data is not currently available. For our sources of information see our [Methodology page < https://nil-ncaa.com/methodology/>](https://nil-ncaa.com/methodology/) .

Non-Power Conference Schools face a newly tilted playing field:

Non-Power conference schools have much smaller revenues and their athlete revenue sharing pool will be a fraction of what big schools can – and will – pay. In men's basketball and football, the *average* Power conference player can expect to receive between 5 to 60 times what a non-power conference player would receive.

Recruiting by non-power conference teams in revenue generating sports is going to be much more difficult. Since inception of the NCAA in 1906, all Division I member schools have recruited athletes subject to the same financial parameters: all schools were subject to identical scholarship limits per sport, and no member school could compensate athletes directly. The revenue sharing model scheduled to begin in 2025 will uproot this this long existing level playing field, and drastically alter the competitive balance between NCAA I schools.

Substantial increase in potential athletic scholarships for NCAA I athletes:

The NCAA recognizes that revenue sharing will primarily benefit athletes in only a few sports. To address this issue, the organization has proposed to eliminate existing scholarship restrictions on all D1 sports and instead substitute roster limits. This could create a substantial increase in athletic scholarships especially in non-revenue sports. For example, the scholarship limit in women’s rowing will increase from 20 to 68, in softball from 12 to 25 and in baseball from 11.7 to 34. Here are the new limits under the proposal:

Scholarship Limits		Old	New	Increase	%	# of
per NCAA I Sport	Team	limit	limit	Per team	Increase	Teams

Men's NCAA I Sports

Baseball	M	11.7	34	22.3	191%	305	6,802	12,109
Basketball	M	13	15	2	15%	362	724	5,826
Fencing	M	4.5	24	19.5	433%	23	449	444
Football (FBS)	M	85	105	20	24%	133	2,660	16,907
Golf	M	4.5	9	4.5	100%	305	1,373	3,090
Gymnastics	M	6.3	20	13.7	217%	12	164	250
Hockey	M	18	26	8	44%	63	504	1,834
Lacrosse	M	12.6	48	35.4	281%	77	2,726	3,914
Skiing	M	6.3	16	9.7	154%	11	107	160
Soccer	M	9.9	28	18.1	183%	212	3,837	6,708
Swimming	M	9.9	30	20.1	203%	137	2,754	4,032
Tennis	M	4.5	10	5.5	122%	242	1,331	2,485
Track / X-C	M	12.6	62	49.4	392%	301	14,869	11,942
Volleyball	M	4.5	18	13.5	300%	29	392	610
Water polo	M	4.5	24	19.5	433%	29	566	774
Wrestling	M	9.9	30	20.1	203%	80	1,608	2,805

Women's NCAA I Sports

Basketball	W	15	15	-	-	360	-	5,468
Beach volleyball	W	6	19	13	217%	67	871	1,202
Bowling	W	5	11	6	120%	37	222	360
Equestrian	W	15	50	35	233%	20	700	798
Fencing	W	5	24	19	380%	28	532	506
Field hockey	W	12	27	15	125%	82	1,230	2,024
Golf	W	6	9	3	50%	277	831	2,357
Gymnastics	W	12	20	8	67%	62	496	1,279
Hockey	W	18	26	8	44%	39	312	1,006
Lacrosse	W	12	38	26	217%	130	3,380	4,459
Rowing	W	20	68	48	240%	92	4,416	1,824
Rugby	W	12	36	48	400%	11	528	386
Skiing	W	7	16	9	129%	12	108	192
Soccer	W	14	28	14	100%	348	4,872	10,658
Softball	W	12	25	13	108%	307	3,991	7,024
Swimming	W	14	30	16	114%	200	3,200	6,196
Tennis	W	8	10	2	25%	312	624	2,930
Track / X-C	W	18	62	44	244%	350	15,400	14,116
Triathlon	W	6.5	14	7.5	115%	12	90	110
Acrobatics	W	14	55	41	293%	6	246	252
Volleyball	W	12	18	6	50%	346	2,076	6,159
Water polo	W	8	24	16	200%	37	592	854
Wrestling	W	10	30	20	200%	4	80	46

Mixed / Coed Sports

Rifle	Mix	3.6	12	8.4	233%	22	185	262
Stunt	Mix	14	65	51	364%	2	102	74

Totals

The potential impact of these additional awards is massive. Under our calculations, NCAA I schools could award up to 85,948 additional “full-ride” scholarships. Assuming a value of \$ 35,000 annually per scholarship, this would result in potentially up to \$ 3 billion in additional scholarship awards per year – almost double the estimated \$ 1.6 billion in revenue sharing distributions.

But the actual increase is going to be substantially less than \$ 3 billion. Scholarships awards are optional – a school can fully fund a sport or make awards less than the maximum allowed. Many schools already operate with roster sizes less than the NCAA limit, and they will have a new financial incentive to operate with smaller teams. And sadly, we’re likely to see cuts to non-revenue sports at many schools.

Athletic directors are currently looking at a new reality where the costs of sponsoring a (competitive) non-revenue sport are likely to increase significantly, while the historical offsetting subsidy from sports such as football is being substantially decreased due to revenue sharing. To make matters worse, athletic departments are losing an undetermined amount of support from booster contributions being diverted to **NIL collectives** < <https://nil-ncaa.com/collectives/> > rather than directly to the schools. There are going to be painful decisions to make about non-revenue sports at many schools.

Potential Total Impact to schools from *House v NCAA* settlement:

As part of the potential settlement of the *House v NCAA* antitrust litigation, the NCAA has proposed the revenue sharing model outlined above, as well as removing scholarship limits for all NCAA I sports in order to give some additional consideration to athletes participating in non-revenue sports. For purposes of this analysis we are assuming a school's athletic scholarship costs will increase by 25% – this percentage may be too low as there will likely be intense pressure from non-revenue sports to fully fund athletic scholarships. In addition to revenue sharing and additional scholarship costs, schools are currently losing booster financial support from donor funds that are being contributed to NIL collectives rather than directly to the schools. These three elements will have a potentially severe effect on a school's athletic budget. The estimated potential total impact by school is as follows:

Show entries
Search:

School	Conference	Football Division	Revenue Sharing	Additional Scholarships	Cost
Ohio State < http://www.ohiostatebuckeyes.com/>	Big Ten	FBS	21,000,000	5,779,488	20,253,400 \$ 47,032,889
Texas < http://www.texassports.com/>	SEC	FBS	21,000,000	3,610,803	22,272,474 \$ 46,883,278
Michigan < http://www.mgoblue.com/>	Big Ten	FBS	21,000,000	7,969,319	16,357,054 \$ 45,326,373
Louisiana State < http://www.lsusports.net/>	SEC	FBS	21,000,000	3,147,779	20,137,141 \$ 44,284,920
Georgia < http://georgiadogs.com/>	SEC	FBS	21,000,000	2,963,443	18,326,566 \$ 42,290,010
Texas A & M < http://www.12thman.com/>	SEC	FBS	21,000,000	3,410,965	17,228,714 \$ 41,639,680
Alabama < http://www.rolltide.com/>	SEC	FBS	21,000,000	3,947,942	15,995,406 \$ 40,943,349
Penn State < http://www.gopsusports.com/>	Big Ten	FBS	21,000,000	5,847,097	13,793,489 \$ 40,640,587
Oklahoma < http://www.soonersports.com/>	SEC	FBS	21,000,000	4,652,676	14,817,595 \$ 40,470,272

Showing 1 to 10 of 232 entries
[< Previous](#)
[Next >](#)

The total impact above does *not* include each school's share of the *House v NCAA* \$ 2.8 billion settlement to current & former athletes. This settlement will be paid by a combination of direct NCAA payments (\$ 1.1 billion) and withheld NCAA revenue sharing distributions (\$ 1.665 billion) to schools over the next ten years – see the table below for details.

The wildcard here are the **NIL Collectives** < <https://nil-ncaa.com/collectives/> >. With the advent of the proposed revenue sharing model, the NCAA has indicated that it will step up enforcement of NIL collectives so that payments to athletes are only for *true* NIL, and that these entities are not used as vehicles to circumvent (and exceed) the forthcoming 22% / \$ 21 million revenue sharing cap.

Most schools would prefer that donor funds currently flowing to collectives instead go directly to the schools, where they can be used for areas in most need and even help pay for a school's revenue sharing commitment: i.e., schools should determine how donor funds are spent. Athletic department budgets would be healthier if schools did not have to compete with collectives for contributions from the same boosters. Intercollegiate competition would also be on a more level playing field, as there would be less opportunity for a rogue coach to gain an unfair recruiting advantage by using a collective to do an end-around the revenue sharing caps.

The above data includes public NCAA Division I colleges only, comprehensive private school data is not currently available. For our sources of information see our **Methodology page** < <https://nil-ncaa.com/methodology/> > .

Are Non-Power Conference Schools getting hosed in proposed *House v NCAA* settlement?

Under the proposed \$ 2.8 billion *House* settlement, the NCAA will pay \$ 1.1 billion directly from its reserve funds and the remaining \$ 1.665 billion will be paid by schools via reduced NCAA income distributions over the next ten years. But the proposed allocation of the

amount due from schools is receiving some justified criticism. Under the proposal, Power conference schools will be responsible for \$ 675 million or about 40% and all other NCAA I schools will be responsible for \$ 990 million or around 60%. The issue is that Power conference schools account for over 80% of athletic revenues while all other D1 schools account for less than 20%. At first glance this appears inequitable, because as a percentage of annual revenue, non-power schools are paying about 6 times more of the *House* settlement than Power 5 schools:

House V NCAA Proposed Settlement	# of Schools	%	Total	Per School Total	Per School Annually	Avr Annual Revenue	% paid per year
Power Conference Schools	70	40%	\$ 675 million	\$ 9,642,857	\$ 964,286	\$ 100,420,042	1%
All Other NCAA I Schools	292	60%	\$ 990 million	\$ 3,390,411	\$ 339,041	\$ 5,445,470	6%
Total	362		\$ 1.665 billion				

The NCAA's presumed position on this is that the proposed settlement allocation matches the sources of the revenue streams it distributes to schools, and what a school may have in other revenue is irrelevant. While this position is valid, whether it is truly equitable remains up for debate. The plaintiffs in *House* are all former Power conference athletes, and it's not unreasonable to argue that it appears non-Power conference schools are being asked to pay for more than their fair share. Allocating the settlement instead to match school or conference revenues would result in *all* NCAA I schools paying about 2% of their annual revenue.

School support of Athletic Programs by Percentage:

There is a direct relationship between Athletic Department Revenues and what a school needs to internally contribute to support its athletic department. Schools with substantial revenues from ticket sales, booster contributions and TV contracts require little or no school support. But most Athletic Departments have limited outside revenue and must rely on school funds & student fees to a significant extent to support their athletic programs:

Show

10

entries

Search:

NCAA I Schools	Total AD	School &	Ticket		Rights &	Student
Public Universities	Revenue	Student %	Sales	Contributions	Licensing	Fees
Ohio State	251,615,345	0%	59,649,921	63,582,228	104,211,451	- 102,794 24,068,951
Texas	239,290,648	0%	57,543,166	77,974,073	94,128,116	- - 9,645,293
Alabama	214,365,357	8%	44,211,016	53,113,300	83,989,823	- 17,577,998 15,473,220
Michigan	210,652,287	0%	55,266,135	44,258,631	91,652,498	- 188,808 19,286,215
Georgia	203,048,566	2%	37,192,353	74,315,945	77,447,079	3,530,802 - 10,562,387
LSU	199,309,382	0%	46,594,942	75,929,827	71,943,756	- - 4,840,857
Texas A&M	193,139,619	0%	50,624,287	54,204,110	76,984,470	- - 11,326,752
Florida	190,417,139	3%	34,784,702	61,364,272	75,817,625	2,559,134 2,706,111 13,185,295
Penn State	181,227,448	0%	44,678,657	39,248,059	77,552,680	- - 19,748,052
Oklahoma	177,320,217	0%	46,977,771	43,180,134	69,875,826	- - 17,286,486

Showing 1 to 10 of 232 entries

◀ Previous

Next ▶

The emergence of revenue sharing & [NIL collectives](https://nil-ncaa.com/collectives/) is going to substantially widen the already large financial gap between big revenue schools and everyone else. The NCAA is in a very difficult situation, while it truly strives to have member schools compete fairly, settlement of the ongoing anti-trust cases may require that competitive equity be sacrificed. However, athletics is key part of the college experience. It's important that the necessary steps be taken to maintain as level of a playing field as possible between all NCAA I schools.

* See [our disclosure of Methodology](https://nil-ncaa.com/methodology/) as to how these estimates were arrived at:

Summary of all NIL Collectives: < <https://nil-ncaa.com/collectives/>>

Most everything you want – or not want to know – about **NIL Collectives < <https://nil-ncaa.com/collectives/>>**.

Additions or Changes? Contact us at: edits@nil-ncaa.com

Statistics compiled & edited by Patrick O'Rourke, CPA Washington, DC 
